



**FEDERAL COURT  
OF AUSTRALIA**

**SELECTION REPORT SIGNATURES**

**Part 1: Vacancy Details**

Scout Reference Number	99097
Job Title	National Registrar
Classification	EL / Legal 1
Location	Any Capital City
Number of applications received	58
Number of candidates shortlisted	8
Recommendation/s based on	Application <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Interview <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Referee Report <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

**Part 2: Panel Approval**

The undersigned have read the selection report and agree with its content. They are aware of the correct policy and procedures for merit selection and certify that these have been followed.

	Chairperson	Panel Member	Panel Member
Name	SIA LAGOS	DAVID PRINGLE	Andrea Farrell
Job Title	<del>LEGAL COUNSEL</del> NOR	DNDR	Director National Operations
Sign			
Date	5/10/2018	5.10.18	5/10/18

**Part 3: Delegate Approval**

Recommendation/s Endorsed: Yes ☒ No ☐

Name	SIA LAGOS	Comments
Sign		
Date	5/10/2018	

Once this page has been signed in full, please return it along with the referee reports, interview questions and any other relevant documents to: [recruitment@fedcourt.gov.au](mailto:recruitment@fedcourt.gov.au)

**SELECTION REPORT – NATIONAL REGISTRAR**

Please note: This report only shows the candidates that were short-listed.

Candidate	Summary	Status
Adam Bundy	Overall Rating (1-5) = 4	Recommended Candidate

Rohan Muscat	<p>Overall Rating (1-5) = 4</p> <p>Rohan provided a strong application, which led to a subsequent interview. At interview, Rohan was full of energy, gave great depth to his responses to the questions, and was able to demonstrate how he meet the selection criteria to a very high standard. Rohan's referee gave a very good report, which confirmed the panel's unanimous view that Rohan should be offered one of the National Registrar roles.</p> <p>Rohan is legally qualified and worked a Senior Legal Case Manager within the NOR team, and prior to that was a Legal Case Manager in the NSW registry. Rohan has therefore developed a very good understanding of the Federal Court jurisdiction, practices and procedures, and has built very good relationships with key stakeholders. He has the ability to learn new things quickly, and wants to continue learning and growing. He enjoys a challenge and sees this role as the next step for him, which the panel agrees with.</p> <p>Rohan's referees both spoke of the quality of work that Rohan produces; and how he is always positive and is a delight to work with. One of them mentioned that he is "driven to succeed without being driven by ego or status, which is special."</p> <p>In comparison to other candidates, Rohan was one of the lead applicants in terms of being able to demonstrate his suitability against the selection criteria. He was very excited about building a career at the court. His referee outlined that he is a lifelong learner and believes he will be an asset to the court for many years to come.</p>	Recommended Candidate
Meredith Cridland	<p>Overall Rating (1-5) = 4</p> <p>Meredith provided together a strong application, which led to a subsequent interview. At interview, Meredith was very clear and concise and gave great depth to her responses to the questions, and was able to demonstrate extensively her claims against the selection criteria. Meredith's referees gave</p>	Recommended Candidate

	<p>very good reports, which confirmed the panel's unanimous view that Meredith should be offered one of the National Registrar roles.</p> <p>Meredith has been a solicitor since 1990 and has a wealth of litigation experience in multiple practice areas. Meredith has a good blend of both legal and management experience, which would be highly regarded in this role. Both referees spoke about how passionate she is about the law, and that she enjoys helping people find pathways to solving issues.</p> <p>Meredith has a good understanding of the Federal Court jurisdiction and demonstrated that she would learn new areas by undertaking a lot of research and asking questions of her colleagues. Her referees both outlined she is a fast learner.</p> <p>Meredith demonstrated the ability to evaluate information and make sound judgment, which was supported by her referees who advised thatat Choice she was great at collating and analysing information, and proposing direction in regards to the projects she was working on.</p> <p>Meredith demonstrated her strong communication skills and outlined how she has dealt with a variety of stakeholders throughout her career, which she would draw upon in communicating with judges and other stakeholders at the court. Meredith believes in being respectful and honest when communicating with others. Her referees both mentioned that her interpersonal and communication skills are her biggest strengths.</p> <p>In comparison to other candidates, Meredith was a lead applicant and the panel believe she has a bright future at the court.</p>	
Rachel	<p>Overall Rating (1-5) = 3</p> <p>Rachel provided a good written application, which lead to a subsequent interview. At interview, Rachel was able to outline her skills and experience against the questions asked by the panel and selection criteria. Rachel then had a second interview, as one of the panel members was unable to attend the first one. Two referees were contacted for Rachel and they outlined her specialist expertise in tax law.</p>	Unsuccessful

	<p>Rachel is legally qualified and currently works at _____ as the Director, Tax Counsel Network. Rachel has a lot of experience in tax law, has worked as senior levels, and is often tasked with the most complex matters.</p> <p>Rachel has a limited understanding of the Federal Court's jurisdiction as she only works in tax law, however she outlined that she would research and ask many questions of colleagues to learn new practice areas. One of her referees also noted that often the issue with the cases she works on at the ATO are more than just tax related so she researches other areas of the law regularly.</p> <p>Whilst Rachel meets most of the selection criteria, she does not have the same breadth of experience at the top rated candidates, and therefore would require more training to perform in the role. The panel agree she is not suitable on this occasion.</p>	
Michelle	<p>Overall Rating (1-5) = 3</p> <p>Michelle provided a good written application, which lead to a subsequent interview. At interview, Michelle was able to outline her skills and experience against the questions asked by the panel and selection criteria. Two referees were contacted for Michelle and they both gave reports and outlined the growth that they had seen in Michelle.</p> <p>Michelle is legally qualified and was admitted to practice in the Supreme Court of Victoria over 10 years ago. Her current role is with the Victorian Law Reform Commission as a Senior Policy lawyer, and prior to that with the Law Institute of Victoria. Michelle was engaged to assist with a project to undertake extensive research into class action litigation funding including review of current case management and procedures nationally and internationally and advising on current policy issues. She</p>	Unsuccessful

	<p>has gained experience in Court practice and procedure at a State level primarily with some knowledge of federal. There would be quite a lot of learning to get up to speed with federal court practices and procedures.</p> <p>Michelle has experience in dealing with change, primarily around changes in legislation and working as part of a team on projects to make recommendations or disseminate information out once changes are made. Whilst at Law Institute of Victoria, she was part of the team who created a daily news bulletin that went out to members, advising changes and providing links to further information. This lead to information getting to members a lot quicker.</p> <p>Michelle has good communication skills. Both referees outlined that she is a confident person and is able to deal with a range of stakeholders at different levels. They also outlined how she is a good team player, and goes out of her way to ensure she helps others in the team as much as possible. However, at times, she can have too high expectations for junior staff but it is something they have seen growth in.</p> <p>Whilst Michelle meets most of the selection criteria, she does not have the same breadth of experience at the top rated candidates, and therefore would require more training to perform in the role. The panel agree she is unsuccessful on this occasion.</p>	
<p>Alexandra</p>	<p>Overall Rating (1-5) = 2</p> <p>Alexandra provided a good written application and during the interview, her responses to the questions from the panel were good. Two referees, who worked with Alexandra at the Supreme Court of Victoria, were contacted and they provided an overview of Alexandra's role and responsibilities at the Supreme Court.</p> <p>Alexandra is legally qualified and has worked as a solicitor. In Alexandra's roles at the Supreme Court, she has gained experience in Court practice and procedure at a State level but has limited knowledge of federal court jurisdiction and practice.</p> <p>Alexandra's current role at the Supreme Court is more focused on corporate and human services functions such as judicial support in relation to staffing, rather than legal aspects. In her current role</p>	<p>Unsuccessful</p>

	<p>she has assisted with improving practice, this involved updating the recruitment processes for judicial support roles, by moving from an individual based recruitment exercise to a bulk format, and then a panel assessed and created an initial shortlist of candidates before judges needed to get involved in the recruitment process. This has proven to save time in the recruitment process of judicial support staff.</p> <p>Alexandra has good communication skills, and is able to work with a variety of stakeholders. One of her referees outlined that she is the type of person who works well with everyone and works very well in a team, however sometimes needs some encouragement with the wider team. She has had situations where judges have not always been easy to deal with but she has been at the forefront of those issues to help find solutions.</p> <p>In comparison to other candidates, Alexandra was not able to demonstrate her suitability as much as the top rated candidates. The panel agrees that whilst Alexandra meets some of the selection criteria to a suitable standard, she would require significant development to perform in the role and therefore is not suitable on this occasion.</p>	
Anna	Overall Rating (1-5) = 2	Unsuccessful
Mark	After attending an interview, Mark withdrew his application as he took a job elsewhere.	Withdrew Application